

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application and the rejection of claims 13, 15-17 and 19-33 are respectfully requested. Applicants have attempted to address every objection and ground for rejection in the Office Action dated June 9, 2003 (Paper No. 11) and believe the application is now in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. The claims have been amended to more clearly describe the present invention.

Applicants acknowledge the allowability of claims 22 and 25. Accordingly, claim 13 has been amended to incorporate features of canceled claims 21 and 22 and as such is submitted to be in allowable form.

Claims 17, 28 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite regarding an alleged incompatibility between the blade and sheath portions being substantially coaxial, yet the blade portion forming a right angle. Support for the basic structure is shown in FIGs. 16 and 17, and the corresponding description on page 23, lines 11-17 of the present application. To clarify this point, claims 17, 28 and 31 have been amended to recite, among other things, that the blade portion includes a portion forming a right angle relative to the blade formation. With this amendment, the rejection under Section 112 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by LaPointe et al. (US 5,518,298), cited previously. LaPointe discloses a seatback bracket 92 mounted in an offset relationship to the frame 26, and configured for sliding engagement

with a mating bracket 93, connected to members 46 of the seatback. La Pointe fails to disclose a mounting formation for the bracket 93, and further fails to disclose any opposing relationship between a mounting formation of the bracket 93 and a mounting formation of the bracket 92.

In contrast, as amended, claim 19 includes features of canceled claim 23 and recites, among other things, that the mounting formation of the sheath portion and the mounting formation of the blade portion are in opposed relationship to each other. A preferred embodiment of the claimed opposing relationship is depicted in FIGs. 6 and 14 of the present application. In view of LaPointe's failure to even disclose a mounting formation for the bracket 93, the structure now recited in claim 19 is submitted to be patentably distinguishable thereover. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 19 is respectfully traversed.

Claims 13-17, 20, 21, 23-24 and 26-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Knabusch et al (US 3,525,549). Claims 13-17 are now submitted to be in allowable form as stated above, and the cancellation of claims 23, 32 and 33 renders the rejection of those claims moot. Knabusch discloses a detachable chair back including a generally vertically projecting elongate link 15 with an upstanding end 17 which is matingly engaged by a slide bracket 34 on the seat back. The link 15 is mounted to the seat through a bracket assembly 19, 21, 24, etc.

As amended, claim 20 includes features of canceled claims 32 and 33 and recites, among other things, that upon assembly of the bracket, the mounting formation of the

